



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Pauline Epistles is not the product of Paul's mind, but that it goes back to the teaching of Christ, to the expectations of the Jews, and to the memories of the earliest disciples (p. 69 f.). This judgment comes dangerously near containing the maximum of error in the minimum of space. Paul's influence on Christian thought is traced to two sources — his rabbinical training and the reality of his Christianity. The exegesis and theological categories of the Jewish schools are present in the apostle's letters because they belonged to his *Weltanschauung*, but they are by no means the heart of Paulinism. It was Paul's personal religious experience that shaped his thinking and gave vitality to his message. This truth we cannot easily over-emphasize, and in so far as Dr. Headlam's conservative treatment of Paul and Christianity contributes to this end it is to be commended.

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH.

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA. Their Origin, Teaching, and Contents. W. O. E. OESTERLEY. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1914. Pp. 554. \$3.00.

The purpose of this book is to encourage the reading of the Apocrypha, and to give the information needed to make the reading intelligent. Part I, the Prolegomena, treats, with undue repetitions, of such subjects as Greek influence on Judaism and its literature, the work of the scribes, their editing of the canon and their writing of other books, the character of the Pharisaic and Sadducean parties, and the movement, in part distinct from both, which expressed itself in the apocalypses. Part II is Introduction proper, and discusses the usual problems of the date, authorship, composition, contents, and purpose of the books of our English Apocrypha.

Whether the task itself which the author thus sets himself is well defined is a question. From the historian's point of view the Apocrypha is almost — though not quite — an accidental selection from the extra-canonical literature of Judaism. That these books passed over from the Greek Old Testament to the Old Latin, and so to the Vulgate, indicates something as to their age and currency and influence; but there are other books, such as Enoch, the Psalms of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Apocalypse of Baruch, IV Maccabees, which are more important to the New Testament student than some of the books of the Apocrypha. It is desirable that these also should be accessible and their reading

encouraged. Such books are touched upon briefly and superficially in the Prolegomena of the present work. All the more ought a clear account to be given of the origin of the Apocrypha as a collection, and of its place and use in the Christian church, Catholic and Protestant. This we miss in the present work.

Accepting, however, the writer's limitation of his task, the question remains as to the quality of the performance. One cannot escape the impression that this large and rather expensive book has been hastily put together. The author can hardly have read it through in its present form. On page 83 f., for example, we read: "Jewish belief on this subject [immortality] has already been dealt with in Part I, chap. ix, f." The reference is to a much later passage, chap. xii, pp. 288 ff. The higher critic will infer that pages 80-86 were once a part of the treatment of the Book of Wisdom, in Part II.

More serious are certain inconsistencies in the treatment of Sadduceeism and the Book of Sirach. The most distinctive feature of Oesterley's book is his acceptance in large measure of the views of Leszynsky's *Die Sadduzäer*, 1912. On the basis of this treatment he concludes that the original mark of the Sadducee was a conservative adherence to the written Law, and the rejection of the authority of the oral traditions of the Pharisees. Sadduceeism was not primarily a political party, and was not, in general, hellenizing or worldly and irreligious in its tendency. It was the party of "the Torah as traditionally interpreted"; this meant that Sadduceeism gained a partial triumph, and that Rabbinical Judaism was a synthesis of Pharisaic and Sadducean elements. Another main distinction of the Sadducees was their expectation of a Messiah of priestly instead of Davidic descent. Further, they urged a solar against the Pharisaic lunar calendar. They rejected the doctrine of resurrection, but only as an unwarranted addition to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which they accepted from Hellenism. They did not deny angels, since that would be to depart from the Pentateuch, but only the theory that the pious dead became angels. Yet they were the party of enlightenment, and in some undefined sense not inconsistent with their fundamental loyalty to the Law, they were friendly to Hellenistic culture.

In spite of this conception of the Sadducees Oesterley still holds the usual view that Jesus son of Sirach, before Sadduceeism proper, was a man of the Sadducean tendency, and that I Maccabees is a Sadducean history. But Leszynsky is followed in ascribing other books to the same party—Enoch 72-82, and possibly other parts of that apocalypse; the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, because

of its Levitical Messiah, "written by a Sadducee for the purpose of making peace with the Pharisees"; the Book of Jubilees, because of its strict legalism. Leszynsky is not followed in his ascription of the Assumption of Moses to the Sadducees. Tobit is regarded as a mixture of the three tendencies, Pharisaic, Sadducean, and Apocalyptic.

These positions, if not hastily adopted, are certainly insufficiently argued, and are not carried through consistently. That Sirach is Sadducean in character is uniformly affirmed; but Sirach "combated the rising influence of Greek thought and culture" (p. 327), whereas the Sadducees and their forebears in pre-Maccabean times were friendly to Hellenistic culture even to the point of disloyalty to their nation and religion (pp. 154-156). Again we read of Sirach in one place that "there is no mention of angels or demons in the book" (p. 340); in another that "in two passages there is a distinct mention of angels, viz. 42 16 (17), 43 26" (p. 300). Both of these contradictory observations are made to prove the Sadducean character of Sirach. So as to a future life, we are told of his "dreamy belief or non-belief," seen in such passages as 10 4, 38 16-23, and that no passages occur "which show the slightest advance on the teaching which these contain" (p. 337); while elsewhere it is inferred from 22 11, 30 17, etc. "that the annihilation of the spirit as well as the body is evidently not contemplated" (p. 288). Again these divergent views are both declared to be Sadducean.

These obvious inconsistencies appear to be due to the partial adoption of Leszynsky's position, and to the failure to eliminate survivals of the influence of Cowley, from whose article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* Oesterley concludes, in his *Ecclesiasticus* (Cambridge Bible, p. xxvi f.), that the Zadokites are to be distinguished as the conservative priestly party from the Sadducees, the party of sympathizers with foreign ideas, who rejected distinctively Jewish beliefs. The Sadducees cannot have been both the party of conservative adherence to the Law and the party represented by the extreme Hellenizers of the pre-Maccabean days. Oesterley seems to waver between these two definitions, neither of which, perhaps, is quite correct, certainly neither a correct characterization of the Book of Sirach. In general he puts too much emphasis on the question which of the several books is Pharisaic and which Sadducean; though it is occasionally pointed out that a writer may very well be neither the one nor the other.

The effort to distinguish foreign elements from native Jewish developments in the religion of these books, to discover Persian

influence on the one side and Greek on the other, might well have been more thorough. The striking fact about the Judaism of this period is that it is everywhere in contact with Greek culture, differently in Palestine and in the Dispersion, differently in different times and circumstances; maintaining itself against Hellenism by various kinds of exclusiveness or revolt, spiritual or physical; and again assimilating Hellenistic ideas in various manners and measures. But in Mr. Oesterley's book we miss a clear and decisive grasp of this central problem. His treatment, for example, of the doctrine of a future life is not illuminating, although it is a subject in regard to which the fundamental differences between Greek and Hebrew ways of thinking and also their interactions are relatively easy to trace. The Hebrew mind is represented as first coming, under Greek influence, to such a belief in immortality of the soul as is expressed in Enoch 102-104, and then as being led logically forward "to the fuller doctrine of the resurrection of the body" (pp. 107-109). Was Enoch 103, then, written before Daniel 12? We even read of "the doctrine of resurrection for which Judaism was indebted to Hellenism" (p. 39). The discussion of the Book of Wisdom also (pp. 80-87, 298-300, 470 ff.) is deficient in insight and discrimination as to the relation between Jewish and Hellenic modes of thought.

There is, as every one knows, one book with which all other books on the Judaism of the time of Christ must be compared, if their existence is to be justified—Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. This discusses substantially all the subjects treated by Oesterley and others no less important. Besides, and first of all, it is a detailed history of Palestine from 175 B.C. to 135 A.D. Its five volumes in English cost but little more than twice as much as the book before us, and contain four or five times as many words, and, let us say, forty or fifty times as much information. It is true that the English Schürer is not from the last edition, and also that the translation of the first two volumes is marred by numerous errors. Nevertheless, as it stands, it is far better than any other work in English on the history, the inner life, and the literature of the Judaism of this period. One who has Schürer will not need Oesterley.

FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.